THE

APOSTOLIC ORIGIN

OF THE

CHURCH OF ENGLAND:

Her Apostolic Constitution and Doctrine.

BY THE

REVD. DR. BEAUMONT,

Rector of Trinity Church, Toronto.

SECOND EDITION.

Price, 10 Cents.

PUBLISHED BY
E. A. TAYLOR & CO., LONDON, ONT.
HART & RAWLINSON, TORONTO.

PRINTED AT THE ADVERTISER STEAM PRESSES, LONDON, ONT.

1875.

THE

APOSTOLIC ORIGIN

OF THE

CHURCH OF ENGLAND;

Her Apostolic Constitution and Doctrine,

BY THE

REVD. DR. BEAUMONT,

Rector of Trinity Church, Mitchell.

SECOND EDITION.

Price, 10 Cents.

PUBLISHED BY
E. A. TAYLOR & CO., LONDON, ONT.
HART & RAWLINSON, TORONTO.

PRINTED AT THE ADVERTISER STEAM PRESSES, LONDON, ONT.

1875.

BV 761
A 47
B 4
* * *

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

The very favorable reception of the first edition of the "Apostolic Origin of the Church of England" has induced the author to enlarge this Second issue, so as to present a brief but connected history of our Church, from Apostolic times to the times in which we live. It will now be found to be a useful little manual for Confirmation-candidates, for junior students, and for Church-people in general.

Mitchell, Ontario,
Nov., 1875.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

PRELIMINARY - - - - - - - - 5

FIRST CONVEYANCE OF THE GOSPEL TO BRITAIN - 7

ANTIQUITY OF THE BRITISH CHURCH - - 10

ARRIVAL OF THE MONK AUGUSTINE - - 11

INTERMEDIATE HISTORY - - - - - 18

RISE OF THE PAPAL POWER - - - - 21

THE CHANGES IN THE ROMAN CHURCH - - 27

THE REFORMATION - - - - - 33

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND IN RELATION TO DISSENT 39

EXTREME RITUALISM - - - - - 49

THE UNION OF CHRISTENDOM - - - - 51

DESTINY OF THE CHURCH AND CONCLUSION - 54

- - 5
RITAIN - 7
- 10
- - 11
- - 18
- - 21
- - 27
- - 33
DISSENT 39
- - 49
- - 51
- 54

THE APOSTOLIC ORIGIN OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND; HER APOSTOLIC CONSTITUTION AND DOCTRINE.

The early annals of the Church of England constitute one of the most deeply interesting sections of ecclesiastical history. Little, however, is known on the subject by ordinary readers. The following pages are designed to supply the lack.

There are two common and widely spread errors which it is necessary to correct. It is supposed, and by many believed, (1) That the Church of England originated at the Reformation; and (2) That the Roman Catholic Church was the first to convey the Christian faith to the British Islands. Greater errors can scarcely be supposed. It has been to the interest of the Church of Rome to assert and reiterate these falsities, in order to prop up her own pretensions; but no amount of bold assertion can hinder in the end the establishment of the truth.

It is the design of this little treatise to establish, by clear and indubitable evidence, the following facts:

1. That there existed in England a regularly organized Church, with its Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons, *several hundreds of years* before the first Roman missionaries visited the country.

2. That this Church was altogether independent of the Church of Rome, and stoutly resisted Romish encroachments and Romish innovations.

3. That it never came fully under the control of the Papacy until after the Conquest (1066), and that even then, as heretofore, it still protested against the domination of the Pope, on the ground that he was a *foreign* bishop.

4. That at the Reformation, the Church of England once and for ever asserted her own independence; swept away all Romish errors and abuses, and declared the Word of God to be her only authority in faith, morals and worship; that, indeed, at this great crisis she simply *returned* to her original position as the Church of the nation, and as a lineally descended, rightful and independent branch of the Church "Catholic" and Apostolic.

To avoid logical formality, I will refrain from making these propositions the heads of so many sections, but will endeavor to show that they are fully borne out and proved by evidence to be adduced.

In tracing the Apostolic origin of the Church of England, the author will refrain from trespassing on the subject of *apostolic succession*, which is a distinct question.

To prevent misapprehension, too, it is necessary to say that the word "*Catholic*," which will frequently occur, is used in the same sense as that attached to it

in our Creeds. It has been exclusively but wrongfully appropriated by the Church of Rome to her own individual system. The word, however, when first used as an ecclesiastical term, signified *orthodox, general, universal.* In the early centuries of Christianity there was no Roman Catholic Church *distinct* from the rest of Christendom, nor were there any Dissenters of the modern type. The great Christian or "Catholic" Church was a unity, with one constitution but *many branches.* Her true descendant and modern representative—the Church of England of our own day—is in like manner a *unity,* with her various national branches in Ireland, the United States, Canada and the Colonies. Each of these is independent of the rest, yet all have the same constitution, and all are parts of the *one* Anglican Church, truly "*Catholic*" and truly "*Apostolic.*"

FIRST CONVEYANCE OF THE GOSPEL TO BRITAIN.

Various conjectures have been hazarded as to who were the first pioneers of the Gospel in England. The honor has been ascribed to one or two of the apostles, and to several evangelists who lived in the apostolic age. During the first century, and for several centuries afterward, *i. e.,* until about 425, Britain was a province of the Roman Empire, and was occupied by a Roman army, of which many of the soldiers were also soldiers of Christ. The centurions mentioned in the New Testament are all men of commendable character, and many of them appear before us as true and earnest "Disciples." Even in the imperial palace in Rome there were those who were not ashamed nor afraid of being followers of Christ. "They of Cæsar's household" are expressly mentioned by the Apostle Paul in

the Epistle to the Phillipians, written during his imprisonment in the imperial city.

It is probable that many of the Roman soldiers sent to reinforce the army in Britain were Christian men, and would probably carry with them the precious "truth as it is in Jesus." In this way the Gospel may easily have been conveyed. It has been shown, too, that Caractacus, the ancient British Prince, was in Rome at the very time when St. Paul was a prisoner there, and may have received the Gospel. There is, however, a considerable weight of very ancient evidence to show that *St. Paul himself was the first to proclaim the Gospel to the ancient Britons.* The apostle, in his Epistle to the Romans (xv. 24-28), refers twice to an intended journey into Spain, by which he most probably meant Spain properly so called. But he was accustomed to lengthen out his journeys, and rarely limited himself to any particular province. Besides the possibility of pursuing his journeys to the extreme north of the Gallic shore, and opposite to the white cliffs of Albion, by which he may have been induced to cross the Channel, it is a fact that at this time the more extended seaboard of western Europe was called "The Spains." It appears, too, by ancient testimony, that he visited Germany; what, then, was there to restrain his indomitable spirit and hinder him from visiting Britain itself? That he actually accomplished this is asserted by the earliest historical records of the Christian Church; and it is further stated that the journey was performed in the interval between his *first* imprisonment in Rome, mentioned in the last chapter of the Acts, and his *second* imprisonment in the same city, which terminated in his martyrdom, during the reign of the inhuman Emperor Nero.

Tertullian, in the second century, and but a short time after the death of St. John, relates the wonderful spread of the Christian faith in Britain, and says that it had extended in his time far beyond the point reached by the Roman arms.

The historian Eusebius, who was also Bishop of Cæsarea, and lived in the latter part of the third century and the early part of the fourth, mentions England among the countries visited and evangelized by the Apostles. He says that these holy men "passed over the ocean to those islands called the British Islands." Origen, in the third century, and Chrysostom in the fourth, also mention Britain as converted to Christ, and as orthodox in the faith.

Other writers specifically mention St. Paul by name as the great apostle to the Britons. Theodoret, Bishop of Cyprus, in the fifth century, bears testimony to this effect in the following words: "The tent-maker (St. Paul) brought the law of the Gospel to all men, and persuaded not only the Romans and the subjects of Rome, but the Scythians, Bactrians, Cimbrians, the Germans and the *Britons*—in a word, every nation and every race of men—to adopt the laws of the Crucified One." Venantius, Bishop of Poitiers (in France), in the fifth century, tells us of St. Paul, that "he crossed the ocean and landed and preached in the country which the *Briton* inhabits."

All these writers are men of reliability, and men whose works have ever been received as authentic and trustworthy. From these data we at least infer that Christianity was preached and established among the Britons even in the apostolic age. It appears, too, by the testimony of the foregoing and other writers, that the British Christians, from the earliest times, were

held in high repute throughout Europe for their firm adherence to the faith. During the persecutions which raged from time to time during the first three centuries —the death-throes of declining paganism—the British Church had its faithful confessors. In the general persecution under the Emperor Diocletian, in 305, Alban, a British Christian, suffered martyrdom for the sake of the truth. The ancient town of Verulamium, in Hertfordshire, was afterward named, in his honor, St. Alban's.

ANTIQUITY OF THE BRITISH CHURCH.

The antiquity and independence of the British Church are proved by other and valuable evidence. Numerous councils of the Universal or "Catholic" Church were held from time to time during the first four or five centuries, to determine questions of doctrine and other matters pertaining to the well-being of the Church. At these assemblies bishops and presbyters were present from all parts of Christendom. All the bishops met as equals, and the Bishop of Rome had no official superiority over the rest. The British bishops attended as representatives of the British Church. At the Council of Sardica, in 347, at that of Arles, in 353, and at that of Ariminum, in 359, the British bishops were present, and their names are preserved on the page of history. Councils on a smaller scale were held even in England itself, and on such occasions a British bishop would, of course, preside. Thus it appears that in the fourth century the British Church ranked as an equal with the other churches of Christendom; and in matters of faith, we have the testimony of Jerome, in the same century (4th), to show that she was orthodox. "The Churches of Gaul

and Britain," says he, "with those of Asia and the East, adore one Christ, and observe one rule of faith."

On the withdrawal of the Roman army from Britain, in the early part of the fifth century (from about 410 to 425), the country was subjected to fire and sword by the Picts and Scots, and subsequently by the Saxons. The latter introduced their pagan worship, and greatly augmented the labors of the native bishops and clergy in efforts for their Christianization. The Saxon invaders steadily pushed their successes, and possessed themselves of nearly the whole country. The Britons were eventually driven westward, and took refuge chiefly in Wales. Notwithstanding this, however, the British Church must still have made considerable headway in the country, for Bede relates the fact that soon after the arrival of Augustine, the Roman missionary, *twelve hundred* British ecclesiastics were slaughtered by the Saxons, which that historian regards as a judgment on them for their resistance to the representative of the Bishop of Rome. It is much more likely, however, that this sanguinary deed was the result of the ill-feeling stirred up amongst the Saxons by the Roman emissaries. But the British Church had held forth the light of the Gospel among the Saxons for already more than a hundred years, the Saxons having invaded the country nearly 150 years before Augustine's arrival. The numbers slain on the occasion referred to by Bede show how numerous were the British clergy at this time.

We will now consider the circumstances connected with the Roman mission to England.

ARRIVAL OF AUGUSTINE, IN 596

With the year 596 a new era in the ecclesiastical

affairs of England began. Simple incidents often lead to eventful issues. A trifling but interesting occurrence prepared the way for the Roman mission to England. Toward the close of the sixth century, Gregory, who soon afterward became Bishop of Rome, on passing through the market-place of the city, noticed some fine and ruddy youths offered for sale as slaves. On enquiring as to where they had come from, he was told that they were Angli—Angles, or Anglo-Saxons—and that their countrymen were pagans. "Angli!" was his exclamation; "they would be *angeli* (angels) if they were but Christians." Without delay he set his heart on their conversion to the Christian faith, and tried to induce Pelagius II., the then Bishop of Rome, to send missionaries for that purpose. After becoming himself bishop, he proceeded to carry out his project, and sent accordingly, in the memorable year 596, the monk Augustine, with about forty fellow-laborers. This distinguished ecclesiastic must not be confounded with the still more eminent man of the same name, and known as *Saint* Augustine, for the latter was made Bishop of Hippo in 396, precisely two hundred years previously. The mission thus sent out under the superintendence of the monk Augustine was not at first intended to be one of ecclesiastical conquest. It was well known that the country had been desolated by its pagan invaders, and that the Christian religion was at a very low ebb. The British Church for many previous years would seem to have taken but little part, compared with what it had formerly done, in the affairs of the general Church, and was known to be in a weakened and crippled state. It is therefore apparent that the step undertaken by the Roman authorities was altogether one of Christian

benevolence, intended to strengthen the hands of the native clergy, but at the same time, if necessary, to *supersede* them in all matters ecclesiastical. The active existence and flourishing condition of the British Church in former days were well known, for her bishops had regularly, as we have shown, taken their seats in the great Ecumenical Councils. It would appear, too, that the Roman authorities fully realized the fact that the Church was not even now extinct, notwithstanding the fiery ordeals through which she had passed. This is effectually proved by the question put by Augustine to Gregory, as to *his attitude toward the native bishops.* The circumstance is related by Bede, who wrote in the eighth century—(Born 672, died 735, aged 63)—"How," enquired Augustine, "are the *bishops of Britain* to be *dealt with!*"—in other words, was he to act *under* their episcopal authority, or was he to *supersede* them? Gregory's reply was in these words: "As regards the bishops of Britain, we commit them to *your* care." In accordance with this policy, Augustine was ultimately appointed *Archbishop* by his Roman diocesan. He succeeded, after some time, in bringing about a conference with the British bishops, and this he effected with the assistance of Ethelbert, one of the Kings under the Saxon Heptarchy. The place where this celebrated meeting was held is still pointed out, and is called to this day "Augustine's Oak." The observance of Easter was a prominent point of dispute. The British Church had, for long ages, been accustomed to keep Easter at the same time as it was observed by the Churches of the East. At Rome, however, a different time for it's celebration had long prevailed. Augustine resolved at the outset to secure complete uniformity, not only in

this, but in many other things. The Roman missionary, coming with authority from the bishop of the renowned capital of the once great Roman Empire, somewhat imperiously pressed his views. At this manifestation of lordly feeling the British bishops were greatly offended. The demands made on them were no less offensive. To be required to give up customs observed since the days of the Apostles, and to submit to a newly-constituted and foreign authority, were concessions which they positively refused to make. "They answered," says Bede, "that they would do none of these things, nor receive him as their Archbishop." The disturbance thus occasioned was of long continuance. In the reign of Oswy, another of the kings of this period, matters assumed a more decisive aspect. The observance of Easter was still a vexed question, for "it is said to have happened in those times," says Bede, "that Easter was kept twice in one year; and that when the King, having ended the time of fasting, kept his Easter, the Queen and her followers were still fasting and celebrating Palm Sunday." The King here referred to was an adherent of the old British Church, and the Queen was of the *new*, or Roman Church. A Synod, called by the King, was held at Whitby in the year 664, and, from influence brought to bear upon the monarch by his Queen, the result proved favorable to the Roman party. In consequence of this, the British ecclesiastics retired, and resolved to pursue their own ancient course. Negotiation was hopeless. The British Church stoutly defended its ancient independence, and refused submission to the authority of Rome. Yet it must be remembered that the Church of Rome at this period was *so different* from what she is in our own day, as scarcely to appear

the same. Transubstantiation, the celibacy of the clergy, auricular confession, purgatory, and other distinctive doctrines of the modern Roman Communion, were simply *unknown*. There were, therefore, at the time in question, TWO Churches in England, namely, the Old British Church, and her rival, the newly-introduced Roman Church. The strife was between two equally ancient branches of the "*Catholic*," or universal Church; the object of the former was the maintenance of her rightful independence, that of the latter was supremacy. That the establishment of the Roman Church in England was an innovation is admitted even by her own authorities. The "venerable" Bede, already quoted, a presbyter of that Church, and the most illustrious historian of the eighth century, expressly admits the fact. He tells us in his Ecclesiastical History, that "Laurentius, who succeeded Augustine, not only took care of the NEW (the Roman) Church formed amongst the English, but endeavored also to exercise his pastoral solicitude over the *ancient* inhabitants of Britain;" and, like his predecessor, would fain have acquired the supremacy over the ancient Church itself, its bishops and its presbyters. The mission of Augustine was, indeed, promotive of the spiritual good of the people who were appointed to be the foundation-stock of the English nation. Yet the Roman missionaries were all but defeated in their enterprise, for so great were the disasters that overtook them in their scheme, that at one time they had only *one* canonically ordained bishop. The Saxon settlers were, indeed, converted to the Christian faith, but not exclusively by Augustine and his followers. The British clergy, too, were stirred up to increased effort on behalf of the pagan invaders of their land,

but the success of the work was principally owing to the indefatigable labors of the Irish missionaries who came to their aid. The combined efforts of British, Roman and Irish evangelists were overruled, in the providence of God, for the good of the great Anglo-Saxon race. Augustine and his clergy were stoutly resisted on the ground that they were intruders, and, in many important respects, *innovaters*. Yet, at the period under consideration, the Roman Church was truly "*Catholic*," and upheld, with slight variations, the "*orthodox*" faith. Could the old British bishops have foreseen with prophetic eye the corruptions and enormities which are now part and parcel of the Roman Catholic system, their protests would have resounded in echoes, not only throughout England, but throughout the habitable world!

We have, then, before us, unquestionable evidence to show that the English Church was *not* of *Roman*, but of apostolic origin.

The records of Ecclesiastical History testify with circumstantial minuteness to the truth of the following inferences:

1. That the old and original Church in England had her birth in apostolic times; that she gradually took deep root in the land; that she soon acquired a good repute in Christendom; and that she was thoroughly orthodox in the Christian faith, as is stated by Jerome and Chrysostom, in the fourth century, two hundred years before Augustine and his fellow-missionaries were born!

2. That at this early date she had a "Catholic" constitution, with her *canonically ordained bishops and ministers;* that she was *independent* and *self-*

governed, and enjoyed a rank *equal* to that of the then more famous branches of the general Church.

3. That at the period in question there was no Pope as such—no one particular bishop claiming universal domination—but that the various bishops in Christendom administered, without interference, the affairs of their respective provinces. This fact has been explicitly asserted by the most learned men among the "Old Catholics" of the present day.

4. That in course of time, and after prolonged resistance, the innovations introduced into England by the missionary Augustine prevailed; and that the British Church became weaker as her Roman rival strengthened. The further history of this period shows that finally, but not until after the Norman conquest, in the eleventh century, the Roman Church obtained the full ascendancy.

An interval of fully four hundred years elapsed between this date and the great Reformation, and though we must concede that the Anglican Church was, during this lengthened period, under Papal control, yet that control was by no means *absolute*. An amount of liberty was asserted, which showed itself at times in acts of bold and daring defiance of Popish tyranny. But, conceding the fact that our Church was for nearly four hundred years under a modified subjection to Rome, what is that period in comparison with the whole eighteen hundred years of her existence? Was, indeed, her *identity* lost during that time? By no means! She was as much the Anglican Church then, though under bondage to a corrupt and foreign power, as the Jews were still the people of God during their captivity in Babylon.

Let us notice a few of the leading incidents which occurred during the above interval.

INTERMEDIATE HISTORY.

A glance at the history of the Church in England during the interval between the settlement of Augustine, in 596, and the great Reformation, fully begun in 1517, will show that in character and policy she was *always* Protestant. The encroachments of Papal Rome on the rights and liberties of the various Churches of Christendom, like her own errors, were gradual. Up to the time of the Norman Conquest, in 1066, the supremacy of the Pope, though long before admitted in Italy, was by no means acknowledged in England. Great deference was, however, paid to his decisions. A variety of evidence might be adduced to show the independence of action which prevailed in the Anglo-Saxon Church before the Conquest; and even *after* that event the supremacy of Rome was far from being complete. The conduct of William the Conqueror, who voluntarily made great concessions to Rome to secure consent to his seizure of the English throne, made the Pope feel that there was a limit to his power in England, and that the Crown was there supreme. As far as the Kingdom of England was concerned, William prohibited the recognition of any Papal acts without his own consent. He forbade the publication of any Bulls, unless they had his own previous approval; and also reserved to himself the right of *investiture*, or appointment of bishops to vacant sees.

Space permits me to mention only one or two leading events of each century, in the interval in question, to show how far the authority of the Pope was

subordinate to that of the Crown, and of the English Church herself.

In the following century Henry II. called a Council at Clarendon, near Salisbury, where, in 1164, sixteen articles, called the "*Constitutions of Clarendon*," were agreed upon. They were expressly framed to uphold the power of the Crown, in opposition to the pretensions of the Pope. In 1176, however, these enactments were repealed, and the Pope obtained the ascendancy for several reigns.

In the century following these events, namely, in 1246, a stout Reformer appeared in the person of Grossetete, or Greathead, Bishop of Lincoln. This godly man publicly denounced the corruptions and abuses of Rome, and declared the Pope to be Anti-Christ.

In 1296 Edward I. forbade Pope Boniface VIII. to tax the English clergy, and compelled him to submit to this and other restrictions.

Again, in the century following, Edward III. carried resistance against the Pope still further, for in 1352 he passed the celebrated "*Statute of Premunire.*" By this law, all agents of the Pope procuring or publishing any Bulls or Excommunications from Rome were declared to be outlaws; their property was confiscated, and severe penalties were inflicted upon them. It was during this reign that the *final* abolition of *first-fruits*, the tax by which Popes had been accustomed to receive the first year's income of every benefice to which the clergy were newly appointed, took place. During this reign, too (Edward III.), appeared the man who has been styled by pre-eminence, "the Morning Star of the Reformation"—John Wycliffe. About the year 1356 this noble Reformer issued his

first book against the misdeeds and corruptions of Rome. In his preaching and his writings he openly censured the licentious conduct of the bachelor priesthood of that time. The higher ranks of the clergy were as guilty of immorality as the friars, and these he spared not. In consequence of these and other denunciations he drew upon himself the anger of the Pope, who, in 1377, ordered him to be tried. Thereupon he more boldly proclaimed his condemnation of the doctrinal errors of Rome, the supremacy of the Pope, the invocation of saints, the worship of images, the evils of a forced celibacy, and, finally, the doctrine of Transubstantiation, first invented in the 9th century, and made an established dogma of the Roman Church in the year 1215. Wycliffe, who held an eminent position at Oxford as Professor of Divinity, and who subsequently retired to the Rectory of Lutterworth, in Leicestershire, was a devout reader of the Word of God. He was familiar, however, with the Latin version only; but this he translated into good and sound English before the art of printing was invented. His preaching and writings became gradually more and more conformed to the Scripture standard, and were very influential in bringing about those changes in religious sentiment which culminated in the Reformation. He died in the year 1384, but his works were the means of enlightening John Huss and Jerome of Prague, who suffered martyrdom for the truth's sake in the following century. Huss was burned at the stake by order of the Council of Constance, assembled in 1414, and Jerome of Prague suffered a similar death about a year after. At the expiration of another century from this melancholy date the Reformation began. In the meantime, the great saving doctrines of the Bible, which the

then newly-discovered art of printing had promulgated with unheard-of rapidity, were exerting their leavening influence. At the very commencement of the century following that in which Huss and Jerome were martyred, Luther was raised up, in the good providence of God, to proclaim afresh the doctrines which they had preached on the continent, and which Wycliffe had still earlier preached in England.

The Word of God was the armory from which all these valient men derived their weapons—the Word of God was the source of their strength and power—it was that Word, in its eternal truth, which finally won the victory. Within half a century after the commencement of Luther's work, in 1517, Christendom was revolutionized, and the Reformation had become an accomplished fact.

It is thus, I think, apparent that even after the Roman Church supplanted the ancient Church in Britain, her right to do so was never acknowledged; her assumed authority was called in question from age to age, while her enormities and errors were the subject of continual protest and exposure. The Church of England, under certain limitations, was *always* Protestant. At the Reformation, she corrected the abuses of accumulated ages; she set aside tradition, and all merely human authority, and once more took the Word of God as her standard in faith and morals, in worship and doctrine. Let us now go back and trace the

RISE OF THE PAPAL POWER.

Having shown that the origin of the English Church was not at the Reformation, nor yet from the Roman Communion, but in the apostolic age itself, we will turn round and enquire into the antiquity of the

Papacy itself. How and when did the Papal power arise? Who was the first Pope? and in what age of the Church did he first appear?

The assertion that the Apostle Peter was the first Pope is one of the most daringly untrue statements ever made by man! If the case of the Roman Catholic Church be so desperate that the writers, in defence of her pretensions, are driven to falsehood—and falsehood the most gross—we may be sure that agencies are at work which will eventually threaten her very existence. It is often a more laborious work to disprove a lie than to establish a truth. In the questions before us, however, the simple testimony of authentic history is clear and conclusive.

The Apostles Paul and Peter suffered martyrdom in the same year, and both in the city of Rome. Paul, as the Holy Scriptures tell us, was a prisoner in Rome for two years; but if we examine history carefully, there is every reason for believing that Peter was never in Rome at all until he went there a little time previously to his martyrdom. The assertion that he was twenty-five years Bishop of Rome is a monstrous fiction, invented to give *lustre* to the Roman Church, and make it appear that the Pope is the "successor of St. Peter." We can only hold our breath in bated wonder that such an assertion could ever have found credit in the face of so much evidence to the contrary. St. Paul, writing in the year 57 to the infant Church in Rome, or about nine years before the death of Peter and himself, sends his salutations (Romans xvi.) to a long list of Christian brethren, severally and by name, yet he makes no mention of his fellow-apostle Peter. While subsequently a prisoner in Rome for two whole years, he wrote several epistles thence, but nowhere

mentions Peter. In his second, and later imprisonment there, he wrote still further epistles, but does not mention even the *arrival* of Peter!

If Peter were ever in Rome at all, he may have been brought there for trial and execution; or he may have come to the imperial city to visit Paul, and may then have been arrested. There is reliable evidence to show that Peter and Paul suffered martyrdom, but most certain evidence that *Peter never was Bishop of Rome!*

The vaunted successorship of the Popes to Peter is like the dream of the opium-eater—a pleasing but unfounded delusion. For the first *six hundred years* of the Christian Church there was no such person as a Pope. The bishops of the European, Asiatic and African Churches were, for centuries, *equal*, and, as already stated, met on equal terms in the great councils of the Church. If one bishop took rank higher than another, it was because it was conceded to him in virtue of his superior personal influence, or his connection with some important city and centre of Church work, such as Antioch, Constantinople, Alexandria, or Rome. When the Christian faith supplanted the pagan systems of religion, and when Christian kings became the "nursing fathers" of the Church, then, for the first time, a worldly and ambitious spirit began to exert its corrupting influence on the Christian clergy. The title of "Universal Bishop," or Head Bishop of the whole Church, was at first contended for by the Bishops of Alexandria, Rome and Antioch, severally. It was at last openly assumed by John, Bishop of Constantinople, and it is a notable fact that the Bishop of Rome of that time—the end of the sixth century—*strongly protested against the assumption*, as savoring

of Anti-Christ! The Bishop of Rome, who thus protested against the title, was Gregory, called the Great, who in 595 thus wrote to his brother of Constantinople: "You know," says he, "that the Council of Chalcedon (451) offered the title of 'Ecumenic' (universal) to the Bishop of Rome, but that all my predecessors have refused an assumption so full of pride, and *so inconsistent with ancient discipline.*" The very next successor to this conscientious man greedily seized the title, which was eventually superseded by the more distinctive name of "Pope."

The removal of the seat of empire from Rome to Constantinople, about A.D. 330, contributed powerfully to the eventual supremacy of the Bishop of Rome over all other bishops. He became, by this change, the most distinguished personage left in the old capital. A circumstance apparently of but little importance at the time greatly aided him in attaining to that pre-eminence which subsequently exerted such a mighty influence on the history of the Church. About the beginning of the fourth century, and in the reign of Constantine the Great (313 to 337), an exciting controversy arose. It was begun by Arius, who impiously asserted that the Lord Jesus Christ was a mere *creature*, and liable to sin. This startling heresy was decisively condemned by the General Council of Nice, in Bithynia, in the year 325. Athanasius, afterward Patriarch of Alexandria, who took an active part in bringing about this orthodox decision, was proceeded against, and condemned by an Arian Council, held at Tyre in 334.* After being restored to his position by Constantine II.,

*NOTE.—*Let the reader compare the "Athanasian Creed" in the Prayer-Book with the circumstances here referred to.*

Athanasius was again, on the death of that prince, condemned for his orthodoxy by another Arian Council, held at Antioch in the year 341. He now took refuge with Julius, *Bishop of Rome*, who shortly afterward called a council in the old imperial city. The decision was in favor of Athanasius, and was confirmed by the more general Council of Sardica, in Thrace (at which, it will be remembered, that British bishops were present) in 347. This appeal to the Bishop of Rome established a precedent, which finally ended in the supreme jurisdiction of the Pope over nearly the whole Christian Church. Thus, from small beginnings the Papal power grew to that gigantic size which it attained in after ages. From being at first an *equal* among Christian bishops, the Bishop of Rome gained some pre-eminence, then the absolute supremacy, and at last became, by overbearing and obtrusive means, a hard-handed and despotic lord over God's heritage.

The authority of the Bishop of Rome, for the first few hundred years of the Christian Church, did not extend beyond his own province, which consisted of a part only of Italy itself, together with Cicily. A learned writer has clearly proved that which is candidly admitted by Cardinal Du Pin and other reliable Roman Catholic writers, that the jurisdiction of the Pope in the early centuries of Christianity "did not extend to any part of the Eastern Church, nor to Africa, Gaul (France), Spain, BRITAIN or Ireland."

The Council of Ephesus, in 431, decreed that "every province should preserve, pure and inviolate, the rights which it had from the beginning," adding, "that the pride of worldly ambition and dominion must not enter in under the pretence of the sacred ministry." The bishops of the old and orthodox Church in Eng-

land, on Augustine's arrival among them, upheld the decision of this great Council, and therefore refused to surrender their independent and ancient rights to the emissary of the Bishop of Rome.

It was not until the year 606 that the pre-eminence of Universal Bishop, or Pope, was attained. It was conferred by the Emperor Phocas on Sabianus, Bishop of Rome, and the very successor of Gregory, who had protested againt it as savoring of Anti-Christ. Thenceforth the *Papal supremacy* was fully established.

An important event, of comparatively recent occurrence, is to be noted in connection with this transaction. If from the year 606 we date the 1260 prophetical years during which the Papal power was to continue dominant, according to the inspired predictions of the Holy Scriptures, the reckoning would bring us down to the year 1866. But it must be borne in mind that there is a discrepancy of four years between ancient and modern time. If, then, we ADD four years to 1866, we are brought down to 1870, the very year when, according to divine prediction, the temporal power of the Pope came to an actual end!

In this interpretation, however, I am confessedly differing from authors whose profound learning demands almost implicit acquiescence, and who date the temporal power from its full establishment as a *kingdom*, in the eighth century. In the year 727 the Pope revolted against the Exarch of Ravenna. In 755 he obtained possession of the Exarchate itself, and in this way became a temporal sovereign. In the year 774, with the aid of Charles the Great (Charlemange), the Pope became possessed of the Kingdom of the Lombards. The three dominions thus placed under the Pope's sovereignty were the State of Rome, the Exarchate of Rav-

enna and the Kingdom of the Lombards. In sovereign right of these acquisitions, constituting the temporal power, the Pope has ever since worn the *triple crown.*

The events of 1870 seem to show, however, that the year 606 was probably the real beginning of the Pope's sovereignty. In *spiritual* matters, at least, his power was *absolute;* and in matters *temporal*, perhaps as great as when he somewhat later acquired territorial possessions. In these days of sudden revolutions and sweeping changes, it is just possible that the temporal power may be *re-established for a time.* Never did the Jesuits labor harder than now to bring about this event. If their efforts prove successful, the *final* abolition of the temporal sovereignty of the Pope may not take place until the expiration of the prophetical 1260 years, dating from the eighth century—727, 755 or 774, the three epochs when the Pope severally acquired his three temporal dominions. We may perhaps never know which of these dates is to taken as the starting-point in reckoning the continuance of the Papal power until the complete fulfilment of the Scripture prophecies on the subject shall become a self-evident certainty and leave no room for further doubt. We will now briefly consider the *changes* which have taken place in the Roman Catholic Church since Augustine's mission to England.

THE CHANGES IN THE ROMAN CHURCH.

The Church of Rome repudiates the idea of *change*, proudly arrogates as her own the motto "*Semper eadem*," and boasts that she is the *same* now as she *always* was! Let her own history testify. She is indeed still *Roman*, but certainly *not Catholic.* As long as the original equality among the various sections

of the general Church prevailed, the "Catholic" or orthodox faith was preserved. But when the Church of Rome obtained the sway, her unrestrained influence led to serious error. Many of her grossest innovations were at first only the hazarded opinions of superstitious monks under the impulse of "a zeal which was not according to knowledge." They arose in ages of the world truly called "dark," when the Word of God but feebly shed its rays through the moral gloom. Suggestions in theology, which were combated when first made, have in after centuries been received with respect, and regarded as "*ancient doctrines.*" In this way errors which have shocked the Church in one age have obtained the stamp of *antiquity* in another, and some hundreds of years afterward have been adopted as doctrines of the Church. Of these I may specify, as illustrative, the doctrine of *Transubstantiation.* By this term is meant the conversion or complete change of the bread and wine in the Lord's Supper into the body and blood of Christ. This doctrine was unknown in Apostolic times—unknown to the Fathers, the great writers and doctors of the Church in the earlier centuries—and utterly unknown to the world until the *ninth* century! At the end of the sixth century, Gregory, Bishop of Rome (who sent Augustine to England), made the ceremonial of the Church much more showy. The Lord's Supper, which had always previously been a simple ordinance to *commemorate* and keep in mind the sufferings and death of Christ, was now changed into a pompous festival. Superstitious notions began to be associated with it. Gregory's "Canon of the Mass" had divested it of its original simplicity, and laid it open to still furher change. In the *ninth century,* however, Christendom was startled

by a new announcement. A Gallican monk, with the inventive genius which has always distinguished his countrymen, propounded, in the year 831, the opinion that, on being consecrated, the bread and wine were at once really *changed* into the very *flesh* and *blood* of Christ, though still retaining their former appearance. The whole Church was shocked at a doctrine so revolting, and fierce were the controversies that ensued. Treatises were written, and eloquence of the most vehement kind was employed to disprove the monstrous assertion. But give error a fair start, and truth can scarcely ever overtake it! About *four hundred years* afterward, this monstrous notion had acquired the venerable stamp of antiquity, and was respectfully received as "an ancient doctrine." The fourth Lateran Council, in the year *1215*, closed the controversy by establishing it as a settled dogma of the "Holy" Roman Church! Though it has been ever since a *Roman* doctrine, it was never a part of the "*Catholic*" faith. It was not until the *seventeenth* century that the Jesuits succeeded in inducing even the Eastern Churches to adopt it. The same restless propagators of anti-Scriptural error have for more than forty years been working out a scheme by which they hoped to see its adoption in the Anglican Church. May her watchmen be ever on the alert to guard her shrines from the pollution of Papal heresy!

Transubstantiation reduces the Lord's Supper into a *sacrifice*, and the officiating minister into a *sacrificing priest*. However flattering this may be to the vanity of worldly men, it is a dishonor to the Lord Jesus Christ, who "bare our sins in his own body on the tree," and made on Calvary, *once* for all," a *full, perfect,* and *sufficient sacrifice*, oblation and satisfaction," that neither admits nor needs any mimic repetition.

At the very time when the Reformation was making triumphant progress—at the very time when the Church in England and the Churches on the Continent were returning to the ancient Catholic faith—the Church of Rome held the famous Council of Trent. While the former were enquiring for the "old paths" trodden by apostles and martyrs, the latter plunged more deeply than ever into error. The creed of Pope Pius IV. (1564) sums up the decision of the Council in these words: "I profess, likewise, that in the mass is offered to God a true, proper and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead, and that in the most holy sacrifice of the Eucharist there is truly, really and substantially the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity (!) of our Lord Jesus Christ, and that there is made a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and the whole substance of the wine into the blood (of Christ), which conversion the Catholic Church calls Transubstantiation."

I again remind the reader that the "*Catholic*" Church never held any such monstrous, carnal and repulsive doctrine. It was an innovation of the *Roman* Church—utterly unknown in primitive times, utterly unknown to the Fathers, and utterly unknown in the "Catholic" Church for the first eight or nine hundred years of her existence!

Of similar origin have been nearly all the errors which are distinctive of Rome. A chronological arrangement will serve to show the age in which the principal errors have been severally set forth, by authority, as settled doctrines of the Church of Rome:

	A.D.
Supremacy of the Pope	606
Worship of Images and Relics	787

	A.D.
Celibacy (the clergy forbidden to marry)	1015
Seven Sacraments (instead of two) first promulgated in	1160
but finally settled in	1547
Transubstantiation	1215
Auricular Confession	1215
Withholding the Cup from the laity	1415
Tradition declared to be equal to Scripture	1546
Apocryphal Books	1547
Purgatory (a doctrine hitherto optional)	1563
Sacrifice of the Mass fully set forth	1563
Creed of Pope Pius IV., in which twelve new Articles of Faith were added to the Nicene Creed of the year 325	1564
Doctrine of the Immaculate Conception	1854
Infallibility of the Pope	1870

These are only a few of the errors of Rome; very many more might be adduced, such as Sham Miracles, Dispensations and Indulgences, Extreme Unction, and forbidding the reading of the Word of God. It is conclusively proved that the Roman Church has from age to age undergone continual *change;* that theological opinions, which were at first published as mere conjectures, have in subsequent centuries been endorsed as "ancient doctrines," and in utter defiance of Holy Scripture have been ultimately set forth as *Articles of Faith!* The *Roman* Church is no longer *Catholic!* The so-called "Catholic Revival" of the present day is a mighty effort of the *Jesuits* to force upon the Anglican Church doctrines which are purely Roman, but were never held by the ancient Apostolic Church of which our venerable Church of England is the still fresh and vigorous representative.

If the changes in the Roman system related only to matters *external*, they might be borne. Some of them, however, have undermined the great doctrines of the Christian faith, and others have produced a *moral depravity* that has rotted whole nations to the core. The evils attendant on the existence of a *bachelor priesthood* in the Roman Catholic Church, have been known and felt for centuries. Celibacy was never permitted under the Jewish dispensation, nor did it become a dogma of even the Roman Church until the year 1215. Who can think of the *confessional* and the moral evils which it encourages without a shudder? If men knew the questions that are put to their wives, their daughters and their betrothed, by purient bachelor priests in the confessional, they would be driven to desperation.

The women, however, dare not, on pain of eternal damnation, divulge them to any mortal man; nor would it perhaps be possible to find a woman so callous as to be capable of repeating them. Though not put to those who live in the midst of Protestant communities, these are questions which the confessor is *instructed* to ask, and which are duly prescribed in *Dens' Roman Catholic Theology*, and in the *works of Liguori* and other authorities in the Roman Catholic Church. Many of them are of such a nature that the mere repetition of them would mantle the cheek of even a Parisian "*femme galante*," and make her blush as in the blest days of her unsullied maidenhood!

What a contrast the back scenes of the polluted confessional of the Church of Rome present to the outward devotion, religious fervor, sweet music and attractive ceremonial of her public worship! In the Roman Communion we behold the only exception to the world's

universal law—good fruit and evil fruit on the same tree, the same fountain bringing forth sweet waters and bitter waters! Oh, that our hearts may ever throb with thankfulness to God that it is our privilege to belong to the pure, the Scriptual, the truly "Catholic and Apostolic" Church of England! Let us now briefly trace her career through the stirring days of the Reformation.

THE REFORMATION.

It has been the policy of Rome to represent this great event as the result of an angry quarrel between the Pope and Henry VIII. This assertion is like all the rest that have their origin in the Vatican. The causes which really brought it about were complex and many. While pious ecclesiastics, such as Wycliffe, Huss and others, unsparingly exposed the *doctrinal* errors of Rome, Kings and Princes valiantly resisted the encroachments of the Papal power. The writers who lived at the very time, such as Bishop Jewell, and others who lived soon afterward, such as Bishop Burnett, attribute the Reformation in a great measure to the profligacy of the Romish clergy and their well-known immorality of life. The monasteries, the supposed abodes of sanctity, had become sinks of vice, and the general mass of the priests were notoriously corrupt. These facts are attested by writers whose evidence is unimpeachable. The open sale of indulgences for every flagrant sin, with the authority of the Pope, was one of the first things which aroused the indignation of Luther.

But the chief power in bringing about the Reformation was the diffusion of Scripture knowledge, which the art of printing, discovered in the preceding century,

so amazingly aided. It was the Word of God, in its divine strength, that irreparably shattered the Papal system. Rome and the Bible are still in uncompromising conflict, and can never be reconciled. The partisans of Rome all the world over may continue to BURN (!) the Holy Records, as every annual report of the Bible Society still shows, but "the Word of the Lord shall prevail;" "shall prosper in the thing whereunto it is sent;" "shall endure for ever!" It is the chief glory of the venerable Church of England that the Word of God is her foundation-stone, her basement, her top-stone, her whole structure! Her very Liturgy is a compilation, from first to last, of Holy Scripture-passages applied to worship and prayer; and never has Christendom produced such a book of devotion. The most learned divines amongst the dissenters, such as Dr. Doddridge, Dr. Pye-Smith, Dr. Adam Clarke and others, have commended it with ardent admiration. The work of the Reformation was in reality begun by the Bible. The darkness of "the dark ages" was passing away, when at the early dawn of Scripture light the good old Church of England saw that "an enemy had been sowing tares while she had slept."

The rapidly growing light of divine truth enabled her to realize the full extent of the evil, and then, with the help of God, and with the means and agencies He put into operation, the mischief done by the enemy was corrected. Some of the seeds sown had taken deep root and had now become sturdy trees, not, indeed, like the "goodly cedars," but rather like upas trees, poisoning both earth and air. The work of the Reformation was somewhat slow and gradual. In the reign of Heny VIII., when it began, there was first the abolition of the Papal supremacy in England, in 1534.

Then certain Articles of Religion were adopted, with little manuals of instruction, 1536-37. In the year 1535 an English translation of the entire Bible was published by Coverdale, from the Latin and German. It was dedicated to Heny VIII., who ordered a copy to be provided for every parish church in the kingdom, to be read by all who resorted to it. In 1539 a further translation of the Bible into English was issued; it was known by the name of "Cranmer's Great Bible."

In the year 1539 monasteries were suppressed. An order was issued in 1544 for the translation of the Litany into English for use in the churches. Thus, step by step, and year by year, the good work progressed. In the following reign, that of Edward VI., which began on the death of Henry, in 1547, the Reformation still proceeded. In March, 1548, the Communion office was published, and in the same year images were ordered to be totally removed. In the year *1549*, the first book of Common Prayer was adopted throughout England. It was revised and re-issued in *1552*, and differed from the former in many important particulars. The corporeal, bodily, or "real" presence in the Lord's Supper, the mention of "altar" and "sacrifice," and other errors springing out of the doctrine of Transubstantiation, together with prayers for the dead, the use of Romish vestments, and other erroneous practices, were omitted and forbidden. The short reign of the pious young Edward came to an end in 1553, and the crown fell to the lot of a princess whose deeds are blots on the fair name of woman—Mary the bloody!

The prisons were soon full to overflowing with faithful confessors of the truth. A reign of terror ensued. Martyrs of all ranks, of both sexes, and of all ages,

from tender youth to decrepit age, were burnt at the blazing stake! The Bible was savagely suppressed, and, like its readers, was publicly burnt. Archbishops, Bishops and clergy who had embraced the Protestant faith, ladies of rank and beauty, men of piety and worth, and even boys and girls, were promiscuously committed to the flames for no other fault than their attachment to the Word of God. The Roman religion seemed likely once more to prevail, but—("the Lord reigneth!")—the Lord interposed and saved the nation and the Church. Mary died a miserable death in 1558, lamented by none but the Pope and his agents. It were difficult to say how many of England's best sons and daughters perished in the persecution that raged during the whole of this wretched woman's reign. The prophetic utterances of one of this "noble army of martyrs" deserve well to be remembered.

Ridley, Bishop of London, and Latimer, Bishop of Worcester, were burnt together at the same fire at Oxford, 1555. Latimer, when tied to the stake, said to his fellow-martyr, "Be of good cheer, Brother Ridley, and play the man! We shall this day light such a candle, by God's grace, in England as, I trust, shall never be put out!"—Never!

The welcome accession of Elizabeth to the throne took place on the 17th of November, *1558*. The Papal supremacy restored in the preceding reign was now formally abolished, January, 1559. In the same year (1559) the second book of Edward VI. was publicly set forth as the authorized Book of Common Prayer. This book, revised and amended from time to time, is the same as is now used wherever worship is conducted in connection with the Church of England. Throughout the world—from England to India, from New York to San

Francisco, and from Canada to New Zealand—the prayers of the Church ascend to heaven in unity of language, in unity of aspiration, and in the true spirit of "the communion of saints."

The reign of Elizabeth was made additionally illustrious by the more correct rendering of the Bible into English. An edition was issued in *1568*, and was known as "The Bishops' Bible." The more perfect translation of the Holy Scriptures was, however, made in the following reign—in that of James I.—and was issued in *1611*. This is the translation which has become identified with the English tongue, and is at present used wherever the English language is spoken. It was the light of truth which dispelled the Papal darkness of mediæval times, the life-giving power of "The Word" that made the dry bones of the Church to live, and that carried to success the great work of the Reformation of the sixteenth century. Truly we may exclaim with the Psalmist, "The entrance of Thy Word giveth light."

The Reformation was simply a process of cleansing and renewal. The old Church in England was ever the same; the same after the event as before; her continuity was unbroken, her identity was unimpaired. Like the leper cleansed of his disease, like Peter reinstated among his apostolic brethren after his defection, like Lazarus raised from the dead, so the Church of England was cleansed, reinstated and restored to new life at the Reformation. "They that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength: they shall mount up with wings as eagles; they shall run and not be weary, and they shall walk and not faint."—Isa. xl. 31.

We trust that the propositions with which we set out have been established by the evidence adduced. Let us repeat them in the form of a summary.

1. There existed in England a regularly organized Church, with its canonically ordained Bishops and Presbyters, *several hundreds of years* before the first Roman missionaries visited the country.

2. That this Church was altogether independent of the Church of Rome, and stoutly resisted Romish encroachment and Romish innovations.

3. That it never came properly under the control of the Papacy until after the conquest in 1066, and even then only imperfectly, for it continued at intervals to protest vigorously against the domination of the Pope.

4. That at the Reformation the Church of England once and for ever asserted her own independence, swept away all Romish errors and abuses, and declared the Word of God to be her only authority in faith, morals and worship. At that great event she regained her ancient rights and privileges, and simply returned to her primeval position as a true and distinct branch of the "Catholic and Apostolic Church."

The veneration we express for her in our Creed should be the more hearty when we remember that of all the ancient Churches that took their rise in the Apostolic age, she is the only surviving one that still maintains, in all its pristine purity, "the faith once delivered to the saints." Long may she be spared to be a centre of light and beneficence to a fallen and benighted world!

Having briefly considered the Church of England in her antagonistic relation to the Church of Rome, we will next notice her relation to our brethren of the dissenting denominations; and while we congratulate

them that the Word of God is the glory of their system, we deplore the fact that this is perhaps their almost only virtue.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND IN RELATION TO DISSENT.

It seems almost incredible that Protestant Christians, of any name or denomination, taking the Word of God as their guide, could be found manifesting the hostility cherished by the dissenters against the Church of England. It is the more surprising when we have the testimony of history to show that but for the Church of England, at the time of the Reformation, the Bible and religious liberty would have been as completely extinguished in Great Britain as in Italy and Spain. The Church of Scotland, the fortress of Presbyterianism, could never have become what she is, but for the moral and political support of England to her worthy reformers. But for the same protective power, the Puritans, Baptists and other sects originating at this great crisis, would have been swept away as chaff before the wind. These and a thousand sects besides would have been unknown beyond the days in which they were started. They all owe their very being and existence to the venerable Church of England.

The hostility and bitterness which would be otherwise inexplicable are easily understood when we remember that from generation to generation it has been the policy of the Jesuits to pit dissenters against the Church and the Church against dissent, and so, if possible, to bring Protestantism into contempt, or reduce it to a state of weakness incompatible with active aggression.

There can be no denial of the fact that many stringent laws were passed about the time of the Reformation, and for more than a century afterward, that

pressed very heavily upon dissenters. Bunyan, in England, in the seventeenth century, was cast into prison, and about the same time cruel force was resorted to in Scotland to compel the people to adopt Protestant Episcopacy. While the former was the result of jealous legislation, the latter was owing to Jesuitical intrigue, with the object of making Protestant Episcopacy hateful to the Scotch. In this the Jesuits fully succeeded. At this time they were continually plotting to revolutionize England, intending either to restore the Papal power or destroy the nation. This has been the policy of the Jesuits in *every State in Christendom* where the open Word of God has given birth to Protestantism. Laws were necessitated to counteract this mischievous influence and to protect the Protestant faith. Many intelligent dissenters are aware of these circumstances and take them into due consideration. As to those who scoff at the Church of England, and say that because we profess to "believe in the Holy Catholic Church," we are therefore "next to Romanists," and that "there is but a paper wall between the two," I leave them to the solace of their own mistaken ideas, and readily admit that there *is* "a *paper wall*," impervious and impassable, and that it is made of "the *leaves of the Bible.*"

There are many pious dissenters who have no hostile feelings toward the Church, but who simply prefer a kind of worship altogether *ex tempore* and without Liturgy. Many of these persons frequently avail themselves of our edifying and devotional service. There are others, however, who make angry objections to our Liturgy, Articles and Creeds, and to our Episcopacy itself. I will endeavor to give a very brief notice to their objections.

1. THE LITURGY, ARTICLES AND CREEDS.

How any truly Christian man can scoff at the most sublime and Scriptural service ever compiled, either in ancient or modern times, is a matter of pitiful wonder. Millions of happy worshippers, from age to age, have been lifted up by it into a state of pious ecstasy, and have found that peace which passeth all understanding. While the mind has been illuminated by divine instruction, the heart has been softened and prepared to receive, in all its fulness, "the truth as it is in Jesus." Are the rambling prayers often to be heard in dissenting chapels to be compared with the beautiful Liturgy of the Church of England? The whole texture of our *Public Service*—for such the word *Liturgy* means—is made up of the woof and the weft of Scripture truth and Scripture phraseology. The Book of Psalms, the divinely-inspired Manual of Devotion of the Church, Jewish and Christian, for nearly *three thousand* years, constitutes a considerable part of the Public Prayer of the Church of England. The Holy Scriptures are largely read both morning and evening, and are, in fact, the very groundwork and substance of all our public worship. Few who love the Bible can fail to love the services of the Church of England. Like the Word of God itself, our touching and sublime Liturgy is suited to "all sorts and conditions of men," to all circumstances in life, to all stages of our earthly being, from the buoyant youth to the tottering sire, and to all the varied races of men that people this busy world.

The Articles.—Dissenters often rave against the Articles without ever having studied them by the light of the divine Word, and often without ever having

even read them. The Articles and Creeds contain collectively the *Confession of Faith* of the Church of England. Their design was to set forth in clearly expressed terms the Doctrine of the Church as deduced from Holy Scripture. The first Article asserts the unity of the Godhead and the doctrine of the Trinity. The second asserts the Divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ and the purpose of his mysterious incarnation. In the Articles following are set forth the personality of the Holy Spirit, the divine inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, and their sufficiency for salvation. They further assert the divine sinlessness of Christ, and those grand central doctrines of the Reformation—Justification by Faith alone, and the absolute sufficiency of Christ's atonement for the salvation of all men. Dare any man, calling himself a Christian, deny these fundamental facts? All these are doctrines expressly set forth by the Church of England, and are justly regarded by her has necessary to salvation. Why do our dissenting brethren cherish hostility to the venerable Church that has, by God's grace, for so many ages upheld these precious truths?

The Creeds.—Is there not dignity as well as divine truth in our time-honored Creeds? The Nicene Creed, recited every Sabbath day, is the Confession of Faith of the old and primitive Church, adopted by the Council of Nice, in Bithynia, in the year *325*, or 1550 years ago! This "*Catholic*" Creed was smothered by the *Roman* Church under twelve new Articles adopted by the Council of Trent, in 1564, by which it was changed into a form as totally different from the original as man fallen is from man primeval! Which of us, then, is *the* Catholic Church? The dissenter loudly boasts of his freedom from Creeds. History, however,

hows that in all ages the Church has found it *necessary* o define the recognized meaning of Scripture, and to mbody the result in Creeds and Confessions of Faith. he dissenters, on the plea of having nothing before hem but the Bible, allow unlimited latitude of private pinion, and every man is at liberty to hold by "right" ny notion, however extravagant. But for what purose were the various Councils called in the earlier enturies? Simply to refute the errors that arose out f *private opinion*, and, as our Twentieth Article exresses it, not "so to expound one place of Scripture hat it be repugnant to another." I have been greatly hocked from time to time to hear representative men amongst the Baptist, Independent, Methodist and Presbyterian denominations express Rationalistic opinions, and with open effrontery *deny altogether the divine uthority of the Old Testament Scripture*, alleging that "the Old Testament is merely a history!" Is the Moral Law "mere history?" Are the types and symbols of Christ's redeeming work "mere history?" Is the Book of Psalms a "mere history?" Are the prophesies, some so minutely fulfilled already, and others actually now in course of fulfilment, "mere history?" If they deny the inspiration of the Old Testament, they necessarily deny the inspiration of the New Testament Scriptures also. The two must always stand or fall together. These and very many errors besides are the result of *private* misinterpretation. The history of Protestant dissent shows a positive tendency to *doctrinal degeneration*. The old Presbyterians of the seventeenth century, in England, are the modern Socinians, who deny the divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ. The old Presbyterian chapels are the Unitarian chapels of the present day.

The descendants of the old Puritans, who settl
in the New England States, have degenerated into t
modern Unitarians and Universalists. The dissenti
communities on both sides of the Atlantic are deep
tainted with Rationalism. The success of dissent h
been largely owing to Jesuitical intrigue. Nearly a
the animosity of dissenters has been owing to th
subtle, invisible and nefarious agency. Large sums
money have been spent by the Propaganda in Rom
from the time of the Reformation to the present day
in sowing seeds of discord between the various Pro
testant bodies in England, Germany, Holland, and othe
countries. This they have done through the press, the
pulpit and the platform. Their ultimate object is the
re-establishment of Popery. The motto of the Jesuits
is the old one—"Divide and Conquer." The Church
of England has not only been seriously injured in this
way, but has been greatly weakened by the further
multiplication of dissenting sects, and by none more
than by the Wesleyan Methodist schism. It is well to
remind the Methodists that the Reverend John Wesley
was a clergyman of the Church of England to his last
dying moments. He was never turned out of the
Church; he never left the Church; nor did he ever
encourage his followers to leave her. On the contrary,
he expressly warned them against it, and told them
that *if they forsook the Church of England, God would
forsake them.* He never intended to found a new
"Church," but simply to establish a "society" for
mutual edification and for general usefulness. The
Methodists of England have never styled themselves a
"Church," but are simply still, as at first, the "Wes-
leyan Methodist Society." This organization was in-
tended to be only auxilia y to the Church of England,

but by no means a new sect. The Methodists ought at least to respect the Church of England for the sake of the venerable and godly man whom she gave to them. The efforts of the early Methodist evangelists were to "bring in" the ungodly and profligate, but now they seem to be chiefly intent on increasing their numbers by alluring those who are already in connection with other Christian denominations. In studying the career of the Reverend John Wesley, it must be borne in mind that, when he commenced his apostolic labors, religion in England was altogether at a low ebb. The Independents were Rationalistic; the old Presbyterians had completly lapsed into Unitarianism; and the Church of England herself was cold and moralistic. Mr. Wesley's course of action was looked upon as revolutionary and fanatical. To this cause must be attributed the discouragement which his enterprise encountered at the hands of many of the prelates and clergy of the Church of England. Some of Mr. Wesley's most devoted admirers were found among the Bishops and clergy of his own Church, and though they could not reconcile all that he aimed at with the due preservation of Church order, yet they cherished the most affectionate regard for him personally. One of the most learned and pious men of Wesley's time was Bishop Louth. On one occasion when the right reverend prelate was dining with Mr. Wesley, at the house of their mutual friend, Mr. Blackwell, a highly estimable and Christian gentleman, Mr. Wesley desired the Bishop to occupy the place of honor at the head of the table. Bishop Louth, however, declined the honor himself and pressed it upon Mr. Wesley, saying at the same time, "May I be found but at your feet in the world above." Mr. Wesley loyally loved the Church of

England as long as he lived, and nothing could alienate him from it. The Methodist system is as yet too young to afford safe criteria to judge of the future. The memory of the "man of God" who founded it is still so fresh as to keep its members true to Christ. But Mr. Wesley, the great evangelist, may also prove to have been a great *prophet*, and if his followers persistently forsake the Church, his own prediction *may* possibly be fulfilled. Above all sects in Christendom, the Wesleyan Methodists ought to be the last to cherish animosity toward the Church of England. The Articles and Creeds of our Church, against which they, in common with others, declaim, have hitherto proven our safeguards. They are the outworks of the fortification, and we will defend them; but the Word of God itself is the citadel in which our chief strength is centred.

Episcopacy.—The Episcopal constitution of the Church of England is a favorite ground of objection with *all* dissenters. As this was the original constitution of the Christian Church in the earliest ages of her history, the fact that they are *without* it perhaps makes them feel more keenly the line of demarcation. They are, on the whole, one with us as to doctrine, but have not the privilege of canonical orders. Here, then, in the matter of one of their chief objections, we have the advantage over them—the advantage of the Episcopal constitution. When we contend for Episcopacy as of Apostolic origin, we do not assert that the Bishops of Apostolic times were, in point of wealth and influence, like the dignitaries of the present day. But history proves that during the first century it was established, and in the second and following centuries fully settled, as the universal form of Church government. With the exception of bodies of Christians who fled from per-

secution and took refuge in secluded valleys and mountain fastnesses, Episcopacy was general until the time of the Reformation. Our dissenting opponents erroneously state that we have no authorty in the New Testament for the Episcopal order. The Church of England maintains her Scriptural authority for the threefold order of her ministry. "Bishop," "Presbyter" and "Deacon" are terms with which Christian readers are familiar. The word "Presbyter" is synonymous with the word "*Priest*" in the Prayer Book, and wherever the latter occurs it does not mean a "*sacrificing* Priest" as in the Pagan system or the modern Church of Rome, but simply a fully and episcopally ordained minister of the Church of England. The word *Priest* is a corruption of Presbyter—*Presbyter, Prester, Priest.* We must concede the fact that the terms *Bishop* and *Presbyter* are often used interchangeably in the New Testament, and sometimes refer to the same person. All Bishops from Apostolic times downward have been taken from the Presbyterhood. I am aware of the anomaly that there have been *lay* Bishops, of whom Ambrose, Bishop of Milan, A.D. 374, and certain Bishops in the modern Church of Rome, may be mentioned. All Bishops are Presbyters, but Presbyters (or Priests) are not all Bishops. All Bishops can perform Presbyterly functions, but Presbyters, as such alone, cannot exercise Episcopal functions. The Bishops in the primitive ages of the Church, as at present, had certain specific powers pertaining to their office which made the distinction between them and the Presbyters or ministers. The *general* oversight of ecclesiastical affairs, and the act of *ordination* pertained to their office. The Apostle Paul, who personally appointed Titus first Bishop of Crete, thus instructs him (Tit. i. 5), "For this cause left

I thee in Crete, that thou shouldst set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders (Presbyters) in every city as I had appointed thee." Timothy was also appointed by the Apostle to the office of Bishop of Ephesus, having been formerly ordained by the Apostle jointly with the Presbyters. Our Church in like manner admits candidates to the Priesthood by the joint laying on of hands of the Bishop and Presbyters. Both Timothy and Titus were superior to the Presbyters, though inferior to the Apostles. Other Bishops were also appointed by the Apostles. Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch, was appointed to that office, about the year 70, by the Apostles themselves, and about thirty years before the death of St. John. Clement, mentioned by St. Paul in the Epistle to the Philippians (iv. 3), written from Rome during the Apostle's imprisonment in that city subsequently became its Bishop. Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna, who suffered martyrdom, in the year 166, at a very advanced age, was a *disciple* of St. John, and is said to have been appointed to his episcopal charge by that amiable Apostle. Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons, toward the end of the second century, was a disciple of the foregoing—Bishop Polycarp. At this stage of ecclesiastical history the Episcopal form of Church government was universally established, and has continued to our own day. The abuses of the Episcopal office by the Church of Rome, prior to the Reformation, and more especially by the Pope as its head, who in 606 got the rank of "Universal Bishop," decided some of the Reformers on the continent of Europe to reject Episcopacy altogether. Presbyterians, Puritans and others then searched into the New Testament to find support for their anti-Episcopal views, and finding the words *Presbyter* and *Bishop* to be sometimes applied

to the same *minister*, persuaded themselves that their conclusions were countenanced by Holy Scripture. In disproof of this, however, I have cited the foregoing facts, which undoubtedly favor the three following positions:

1. Episcopacy was initiated by the Apostles themselves.

2. It was fully established in the post-Apostolic age, and during the second and following centuries was universally established.

3. It continued to be the general form of Church government until the Reformation.

4. The uninterrupted preservation of this ancient and Apostolic institution to the present time is an additional proof of the Apostolic character of the Church of England.

By far the most serious objection which has ever been urged against the Church of England by dissenters has been made of late years. The serious nature of the objection lies in its reality. Of the 20,000 clergy in the mother country, a small handful of about 500 or 600 (an insignificant number compared with the whole) have been laboring, with a zeal truly astonishing, to *Romanize* the Church of England. The noise and commotion caused by this party, called "the Ritualists," have stirred the nation and unsettled the faith of many. On this movement, known as "Ritualism," I must now offer a few remarks.

EXTREME RITUALISM.

The practices and doctrines comprehended under this designation are unquestionably of a Romish nature —they are *Popery* under another name. They are the corruptions of the Roman Church of *mediæval* times,

but like all other Romish innovations, never constituted any part of the worship of the early Christian Church. The *whole movement* (and I beg the reader to note this) *had its origin with the Jesuits in Rome*, about the beginning of the present century. Romish emissaries had been busily at work in England in endeavoring to overthrow the Church from the days of the Reformation to the accession of William III., in 1688, when "the Protestant succession" was finally established. Stringent laws for the protection of the Protestant religion were passed by our judicious forefathers, who knew Popery better than do the sentimental politicians of the present day, and Papal prospects in England seemed hopelessly lost. The Church of England was the grand bulwark of England's Protestantism, and against her, almost solely, the mighty forces of Rome have ever been directed. It was found impossible to reduce her by *outward* assault, the Jesuits, therefore, resorted to stratagem. They formed a scheme, more properly a plot, which should bring about a gradual change *from within*. It was resolved to send *Jesuits* to the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, but more particularly the former. These designing men actually obtained the Pope's dispensation to feign themselves Protestants, and in this way, after going through the stated course, they obtained ordination in the Church of England. They then set busily to work to influence young men amongst the students of the two Universities who were preparing for holy orders, and gradually, but almost imperceptibly, to train them up to carry on the Jesuit crusade against our venerable Church. In this way a large body of talented young men were unconsciously made the tools of the Jesuit party in what has been styled the "Catholic Revival," and made

occupy, according to their ability, very prominent places in this Romanizing movement. The Mannings, the Newmans, the Denisons and the Wilberforces were thus pressed into the service of Rome, and have proved her most active workers. Others are still more secretly plotting against Church and State alike in the mother country, and England will never again have peace until the Jesuits are expelled. This is the real and authentic history of the Ritualistic movement. It was altogether of Jesuitical origin. The enemy has indeed succeeded in sowing tares in the fair field of the Church of England, but is this a reason why orthodox dissenters should cherish feelings of hostility toward her? Is this the crisis when it is expedient for them to aid her Romish adversaries by attacking her on one side while they attack her on another? The Church of England may, indeed, do without their aid, but she would rather welcome them as friends and allies. Rome is the common foe of all, and now is the time when Protestant Christendom, without sectarian distinction, should come to the help of the Lord, "to the help of the Lord against the mighty."

THE UNION OF CHRISTENDOM.

Much has been said of late years about the "Union of Christendom." Let us, if possible, seek for union, for "union is strength," and the divisions of Protestant Christendom have not only long subjected us to the taunts of "Romish adversaries," but have greatly *weakened* the hands of the General Christian Church. We desire to see union, but not a union with the corrupt Greek Church, nor with similar communions, but *more union amongst ourselves*. It is not only desirable to win back our dissenting brethren of orthodox faith to the

bosom of the Church, but especially desirable that th
various branches of the Anglican Church should b
united amongst themselves. Little is known, either in
England or Canada, of the "Protestant Episcopal Church
of the United States, with her staff of able and eloquent
Bishops, nearly equal in number to the combined Epis-
copate of the mother Church and the Churches of the
colonies. Can we not at least have greater freedom of
intercourse with our clerical brethren of the great
republic? Let our inter-communion with them be no
longer limited to private friendship, but rather let it
assume an *official* character; and let us, in addition to
our own annual Provincial Synod, have a *Triennial*
Synod of the various dioceses of British North America
and of the Episcopal Church of the United States. An
occasional Convention like this would increase our good
feeling toward each other, would promote mutual res-
pect, and increase our strength as parts of the same
great Anglican and Apostolic Church.

The hold of the Episcopal Church on the affections of the people of the United States has lately been confirmed by important statistics, in which her progress is compared with that of other influential denominations. The ten years from 1860 to 1870 give the following result:

The Methodists increased at the rate of 4 per cent.
The Presbyterians " " " 7 "
The Episcopal Church " " " 10 "

Her labors, unaided by feverish and spasmodic "revivals," are steady and progressive; and like her sister Church in Canada, and the mother Church in England, she is quietly doing a great work.

It is, perhaps, impossible to find on earth a Church absolutely faultless. For such we must wait till we are

rmitted to join "the general assembly and Church of e first-born, which are written in heaven." Looking, owever, over the past history of the Christian Church, aking into account the fatal errors which have caused e apostacy of the ancient Churches, and the doctrinal egeneration characteristic of the sects into which mod- rn Christendom is divided, and viewing the *Church of England* in comparison with all, we have reason to thank God and take courage." We do not contend hat she is absolutely perfect, but taking her altogether, nd considering that it has been her great mission in he world to rescue the Gospel from oblivion and to ave it from being smothered under a heap of Popish nnovations; considering, too, how she has been the bulwark of the Protestant world, that the various dis- senting denominations have found toleration under her protecting wings; considering, too, her beautiful Liturgy, her Apostolic Creeds, her Scriptural Articles, her ancient Constitution, her sound doctrine and her edifying wor- ship, we have reason to regard her as the highest stand- ard of ecclesiastical excellence, and the most truly *Apostolic* of existing Churches. She clearly holds forth the great doctrines of the Faith without the cumber- some garblements with which the Church of Rome has mystified them. She sets forth "Christ, and him crucified," as the alpha and omega of her public teaching. She recognizes no auxiliary—neither Virgin nor saint —for she points to Jesus alone as "able to save to the uttermost." She recognizes no mass, nor any other sacrifice but that *once* made on Calvary and needing no repetition—"the offering of the body of Jesus Christ *once for all*." (Heb. x. 10.) This she urges as the "full, perfect and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world." As Churchmen, we

have the advantage over all evangelical dissenters in retaining not only Apostolic doctrine, but also primitive and Apostolic usages and forms. Though we wish them God-speed in their labor of love in extending the glad tidings of the Kingdom, we would fain see them gathering within the walls of our Apostolic Zion, and cherishing that veneration for her as the mother Church to which they owe their very existence.

We have the advantage over the Roman Church inasmuch as we repudiate all mediæval errors and all unscriptural innovations, both in doctrine and practice. The Roman Church, though also Apostolic in origin, and formerly "Catholic" in the Faith, has cumbered her worship with so many anti-scriptural doctrines as to have cut herself off altogether from the orthodox Christian Church, and to have become virtually the CHURCH OF MARY, her chief intercessor, and of the Pope, her chief ruler and so-called "infallible" guide!

The Church of England, notwithstanding what envious dissenters on the one hand and malignant Papists on the other may say of her, is eminently worthy of our esteem, our affection, our loyalty and our veneration. We not only rejoice in what she *is* and *has been*, but in the great and glorious work she is carrying on in the world at this very time. In conjunction with her affiliaries—the Church in Canada and the American Episcopal Church—she is doing a glorious work. She is at this moment laboring in England, in the Dominion, in the United States, in the British colonies and in the heathen world, with greater energy and success than at any previous period of her existence. The Jesuitical agents of Rome are, however, dogging her steps, endeavoring to corrupt her doctrine, laboring to counteract her good work, and fiercely

straining every effort to pull down her venerable fabric, both at home and abroad. They may be permitted, for a time, to achieve partial success. They may succeed in staining her fair name; they may inflict upon her painful wounds, and they may cause her to pass through much tribulation. But she will again arise, and shine with renewed lustre; she will come out of the conflict with the anthem of victory on her lips; she will stand before the world more compact and vigorous than ever; for she is established on the Word of God, defended with Eternal Truth, and built on the foundation of Apostles and prophets—Jesus Christ himself being her Chief Corner Stone.

Can I conclude more appropriately than by quoting the stanzas of one of the most elegant and talented of modern poets—the Right Reverend Bishop Coxe, of the diocese of Western New York?

I love the Church, the holy Church,
The Saviour's spotless bride;
And, oh, I love her palaces
Through all the land so wide!
The cross-topped spire amid the trees,
The holy bell of prayer;
The music of our Mother's voice—
Our Mother's home is there.

The village tower—'tis joy to me;
I cry, "the Lord is here!"
The village bells—they fill my soul;
They more than fill mine ear!
O'er kingdoms to the Saviour won
Their triumph peal is hurled;
Their sound is now in all the earth,
Their words throughout the world!

Then, with the message of our King,
The herald stands on high ;
How beautiful the feet of them
That on the mountain cry !
And then, as when the doors were shut,
With Jesus left alone,
The faithful sup with Christ, and He
In breaking bread is known.

I love the Church, the holy Church,
That o'er my life presides—
The birth, the bridal, and the grave,
And many an hour besides !
Be mine through life to live in her,
And, when the Lord shall call,
To die in her, the spouse of Christ,
The Mother of us all.

T
ORIGI
with
Unite
the cl
of it.
to it
extra
elicit
follov
"
small s
those
Churc
It is c
teache
at vari
who f
the a
Britai
with
posse
jurisd
Roma
and w
trans
mind
on th
into i
Histo
Beau
read.

OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

The *First* Edition of Dr. Beaumont's "APOSTOLIC ORIGIN OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND" was received with honorable greeting, both in Canada and the United States. Several of the Bishops, and many of the clergy, in both countries, testified their appreciation of it. The *Press* was by no means backward in giving to it a word of commendation. The two following extracts will suffice to show the approval which it elicited:

The *Church Herald*, published in Toronto, has the following notice, in its issue of September 4, 1873:

"In this little pamphlet is set forth a vast amount of truth in a small space. We would recommend its perusal to all, especially to those who desire information as to the Apostolic origin of the English Church, and the Scriptural authority for her government and orders. It is claimed for our Church, on the very highest authority, that she teaches "the faith once delivered to the Saints." This faith has been at various times subjected to the assaults of two classes of foes, those who favored the errors of Rome, and those who were influenced by the arguments of sceptics and schismatics. That the Church in Britain flourished in its primitive purity long before it was interfered with by Rome, is a well-established historical truth. She then possessed the same kind of Episcopal government as now. With the jurisdiction of the Roman Bishops were introduced the errors of the Roman system. Both were rejected as the Reformation proceeded, and we now have the truth as delivered to the Apostles, and by them transmitted to their successors. It is useful to bear these facts in mind. On the one hand they warn us against Romish tendencies, and on the other hand they serve as a wholesome restraint from wandering into infidelity, schism, and dissent. These sound principles of Church History and Church doctrine are clearly indicated in outline by Dr. Beaumont, whose pamphlet cannot be too extensively circulated and read."

The *Standard of the Cross*, published in the Diocese of Ohio, gives the following notice of it in the issue of June 14, 1873:

"It is a brief, but very clear epitome of the historical argument for the Apostolic character of the Church of England, and consequently for that of the Episcopal Church in Canada, and in the United States, in its origin, constitution and doctrine.

"The main topic is proof of the fact that the British Church is not Roman, but Apostolic. Augustine was sent over as Archbishop by Pope Gregory only in A. D. 596, whereas the British Church existed from the first century. Theodoret declares that the tent-maker (St. Paul) brought the Gospel to the Britons. Tertullion, in the second century, declares Britain to be subject to Christ. Alban was a British martyr in 303. The Bishops of Britain were present at the Councils of Arles, A. D. 353, and Arminum, A. D. 359; and 200 years afterward the Church of Rome began its encroachments on our liberty, from which we were not set free until the Reformation. It is a forcible tract."